

### **RECORD OF INTERVIEW**

Applicant, through Jack Todd and the undersigned attorney, thanks Examiner Brandi P. Parker for granting a telephone interview on October 24, 2008.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.133(b), the following is submitted as a complete written statement of the issues discussed during the interview. The following statement is intended to comply with the requirements of MPEP § 713.04 and expressly sets forth: (A) a brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted; (B) identification of the claims discussed; (C) identification of specific prior art discussed; (D) identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed; (E) the general thrust of the principal arguments; (F) a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed; and (G) the general results or outcome of the interview, if appropriate.

On October 24, 2008, the undersigned attorney, attorney Jack D. Todd, Applicant's CEO Ms. Radhika Subramanian, and the inventor Mr. Roy Marsten, contacted the Examiner to discuss the Office Action of July 29, 2008, the scope and intent of the present application, and proposed claim amendments to the pending claims that were deemed by Applicant to overcome the rejections and references contained in the Office Action. (A) No exhibits were shown or discussed; (B) a proposed amended version of claim 1 (substantially similar to that presented herein) was discussed; (C) the *Kapadia et al.* (U.S. Pat. No. 7,039,602) reference was discussed; (D) proposed amendments in accordance with the amendments presented in this paper, as well as submitted to the Examiner via facsimile on October 20, 2008, were discussed; (E) arguments in accordance with those presented in this paper were discussed; (F) no other pertinent matters were discussed; and (G) during the interview, Applicant discussed the differences between the present system and that of the primary reference, *Kapadia* (those differences being presented below in this Amendment); the Examiner indicated that the proposed claim 1 submitted October 20, 2008, would overcome the 35 U.S.C. § 101 rejection contained in the Office Action; and the Examiner indicated that an additional search might be necessary to attempt to identify patent references more on point with Applicant's amended claims.

Application No. 10/764,958  
Docket No. 14251-42996  
Resp. to OA of July 29, 2008, dated October 29, 2008

The amendments and remarks that follow herein are intended to be consistent with the discussion during the interview. In the event that the foregoing record is not considered complete and accurate, the Examiner is respectfully requested to bring any incompleteness or inaccuracy to the attention of the undersigned.